

**REMARKS:**

Claims 12-22 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(4) because reference character 11 was used to designate both communication device and subscriber device. The examiner has only stated "refer to claim 12 and line 17" as the location in which reference character 11 is used to designate subscriber device.

Applicant respectfully submits that reference character 11 is not used to designate subscriber device anywhere in the application. The reference character 11 is not used in line 17 of claim 12, or any other claim. The reference character 11 is only used in the specification to designate a communications terminal. Therefore, the objection to the drawings is overcome, and so no revised drawings are required.

Claims 13, 16-17, and 19-20 were objected to for insufficient antecedent basis. The claims have been drafted to avoid the objection and are believed to be in proper form. It is noted that the recitation of the term "the service identification number" did not lack antecedent basis since "a service identification number" was recited in claim 18, from which claim 19 depends.

Claim 22 was objected because the term "line" is recited, whereas the specification refers to a subscriber line. Claim 22 has therefore been rewritten for clarification and now recites a subscriber line in place of a "line".

The examiner has further objected to the specification. First, the examiner objected to the statement in the specification beginning at page 9, line 18. Applicant has amended the specification to clarify that the statement is in accordance with an embodiment that is different from the preferred embodiment shown in Fig. 1. Thus, the inconsistency that the examiner has noted is resolved because the embodiment discussed on page 9 is

completely different from the embodiment shown in Fig. 1.

The examiner has further objected to the use of the term "class" in conjunction with subscriber lines. Applicant submits that it is well known in the art that subscriber lines may be divided into different classes for a variety of reasons, including for example separating business (corporate) from personal use for example. This is only one example however. Classes may also reflect the speed of the subscriber line among other things. It is understood in the art that the term "class" may have a variety of meanings, all of which are consistent with the instant specification, and simply describe a certain type of subscriber line. Since one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of "class" as used in the present invention, application does not believe that further explanation is necessary.

The examiner has rejected claim 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al. The examiner states that Voit discloses,

a communications system comprising branching means (312) connected with a subscriber line (344); switching system (310) connected with one terminal (340) of the branching means (common terminal); and information provider server (314), as recited in claims 12 and 13; LAN 330 provided as associated with the switching system, and connected with another terminal of the branching means, for providing a subscriber device (340) with information through the subscriber line.

Claim 12 has been rewritten and now recites the limitation that the LAN is not directly connected to an Internet. This is supported by Figs. 1 and 3 which show that access to the Internet requires a proxy. This is consistent with the spirit of the invention which is a community or local network rather than a global network like the Internet.

Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach or suggest the limitation that the LAN is not directly connected to an Internet. Voit '648 aims to achieve telephony

communications by means of plural autonomous system type packet data networks, such as for example the Internet, with gateways and a directory server. Fig. 3 of the Voit '648 patent was specifically mentioned by the examiner. Fig. 3 only discloses the configuration of an Internet wherein laptop computers 340, 342 connect to the Internet via dial up links 344, 346. In this figure, switching systems or switching exchanges are not shown. Every component disclosed in Fig. 3, such as information providers 316, 318, 324, LAN 328, 330, Laptop PC 340, 342, are interconnected by routers 332, 334 to constitute parts of an INTERNET. Voit '648 never discloses or suggests a LAN provided as associated a switching system located at a subscriber switching station, which are not directly interconnected with the INTERNET, and the subscriber line which is not directly interconnected with the INTERNET. Therefore, the communications system disclosed in Voit '648 cannot provide a community network for each subscriber station independent from another subscriber station. In fact, Voit '648 completely teaches away from providing a community or local network. Thus, one skilled in the art would not look to the Voit '648 patent for providing a community or local network for each subscriber station independent from another subscriber station.

Applicant further submits that "switching system (310)" pointed out by the examiner is NOT a subscriber switching system as recited in the claimed invention. Instead, the Voit '648 patent designates the reference number 310 as an autonomous system (A/S) which comprises multiple routers shown in Fig. 3.

Furthermore, the information provider server (324) is not connected to the LAN as recited in claim 12. It appears that the examiner has failed to address this limitation in claim 12. The LAN is only connected to the autonomous system.

Also, Voit '648 does not teach or suggest "providing a subscriber device with

information through the LAN and the subscriber line," as recited in claim 12. The examiner states that LAN 330 provides a subscriber device (340) with information through the subscriber line. Yet, the LAN 330 and the subscriber device 340 are completely independent of each other, and are only disclosed to show how two completely different and independent types of systems can be connected to the Internet. The LAN is shown to demonstrate a high speed corporate connection to the Internet. A completely independent and separate public switched telephone network (PSTN) is disclosed as another method of connecting a set of laptop computers 340 and 342 to the Internet. The Voit '648 patent does not teach or suggest that the LAN 330 and the laptop computer 340 can be connected. Thus, the Voit '648 patent does not teach or suggest providing information to a subscriber device through a LAN.

Moreover, the entire purpose of the LAN and PSTN in the Voit '648 patent is to connect a high-speed corporate user or a remote laptop user to the Internet. By stark contrast, the purpose of the claimed invention is to connect a user to a community or local network for a subscriber station, independent from other non-local subscriber stations. Therefore, Voit '648 teaches away from the claimed invention.

With respect to Tonnby '996, the examiner states,

Tonnby et al discloses IP gateway 8, fig. 1, (branching means) and LAN which supports communication using IP protocol (second terminal), from an IP based network and is, further, associated with PSTN/ISDN network 3 (switching system) (second terminal), fig.3, and col.2, line 65.

Tonnby '996 aims to support IP (Internet Protocol) phone service with IP-support modem

4. An IP phone call between the users A and B is established through IP-support modem 4, a subscriber line 5, PSTN/ISDN network 3, PSTN/ISDN connection 15, an IP gateway 8, telephony server 10, PSTN/ISDN network 3 (again), and subscriber line 7. Fig. 5 shows

a home LAN 61 to which PC 2 and IP support modem 4 is connected.

LAN 61 however, is located at a user site that is not associated with the subscriber switching station. Tonnby '996 therefore fails to teach a limitation recited in claim 12. Also, the PSTM/ISDN network 3 is an aggregation of subscriber switching systems and toll switching systems but not a single subscriber switching system. Therefore, Tonnby '996 teaches away from the claimed invention.

The examiner has rejected claim 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,349,096 to Liu et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach one or more elements or limitations as explained above, and thus, the claims are believed to be patentable. Tonnby '996 also fails to teach a recited limitation and teaches away from the claimed invention as explained above. Furthermore, the examiner states that the branching means (241) connects the subscriber line (225) with the switching system means (242) in response to a call out signal sent from the switching means to the subscriber line. The examiner cites col. 7, lines 17-22. At col. 7, lines 17-22, Liu et al. only teaches an architecture in which the physical signals on subscriber loops are split into voice calls or analog modem connections and DSL access. Liu et al. does not teach or suggest connecting a subscriber line with the switching system means in response to a call out signal sent from a switching means to a subscriber line. Therefore, Liu et al. also fails to teach or suggest a limitation of claims 16 and 17.

The examiner has rejected claim 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,796,393 to MacNaughton et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach one or more elements or limitations as explained above, and thus, the claims are believed to be patentable. Tonnby '996 also fails to teach a recited limitation and teaches away from the claimed invention as explained above. Furthermore, the examiner points out that in communications systems having a plurality of local and foreign servers, information such as a service ID and community identification code need to be supplied. MacNaughton '393 states that "access to communities may be provided as the user navigates the Web. In contrast, the claimed invention teaches navigating a local server on a community network for a subscriber station, independent of other subscriber stations. Thus, one skilled in the art would not look to the MacNaughton '393 teaching because it teaches navigating the Web and a communications system having a plurality of local and foreign servers, which is completely opposite to the claimed invention.

The examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,956,391 to Melen et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach one or more elements or limitations as explained above, and thus, the claims are believed to be patentable. Tonnby '996 also fails to teach a recited limitation and teaches away from the claimed invention as explained above.

The examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,021,120 to Beyda.

Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach one or more elements or

limitations as explained above, and thus, the claims are believed to be patentable. Tonnby '996 also fails to teach a recited limitation and teaches away from the claimed invention as explained above.

The examiner has rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,157,648 to Voit et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,996 to Tonnby et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,424,818 to Hirono.


Applicant respectfully submits that Voit '648 fails to teach one or more elements or limitations as explained above, and thus, the claims are believed to be patentable. Tonnby '996 also fails to teach a recited limitation and teaches away from the claimed invention as explained above.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain which may be resolved by telephonic communication, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, if such will advance the application to allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Yan Glickberg  
Reg. No. 51,742  
Attorney for Applicants  
(845) 359-7700

Dated: May 12, 2004

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road  
Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

**Customer No. 21706**

PCM:YG  
Enc.